

07/08/2004 12:29

NIXON+VANDERHYE → 5712731402

NO. 130 0005



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

978-53
A.R.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,330	08/13/2001	Shane Robert McGill	978-53	7091
7590	02/10/2004			
			EXAMINER	
			MADSEN, ROBERT A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

DOCKETED
 CLT/MATTER # 978-53
 MAIL DATE FEB 10, 2004
 DUE DATE MAY 10, 2004
 FINAL DEADLINE JUN 10, 2004
 DOCKETED BY 257 m4

Application/Control Number: 09/913,330
Art Unit: 1761

Page 3

7. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Gordon (US 5363746).
8. See Abstract, Column 11, line 13 to Column 12, line 3.
9. Claims 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Chung (US 6011249).
10. See Column 1, line 65 to Column 2, line 55.
11. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Hochstein et al. (US 6258394 B1).
12. See Abstract , Column 3, lines63 to Column 4, line 31 and claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US 5653157) as applied to claim 48 above, further in view of Wade et al. (US4828866)